

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated August 28, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 14, 15, and 17, and new claims 19 and 20 are added. No new matter has been entered. Claims 10-13 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 14-20 are currently pending, of which claims 1-9 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 10-11 and 17 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 19 and 23 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/824,585 (hereinafter, 585' patent) in view of Hashimoto'920 (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013920).

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the cancellation in claims 10-11 and amendment in claim 17, this provisional double patenting rejection is now believed to be moot.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter, AAPA) in view of Onuma (JP 05-345160). Claims 10-11 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma 160 and Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,395). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamakaki 395, in view of Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013920). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamazaki 395, in view of Hashimoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0083203). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160, in view of Lui (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123210). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamazaki 395, in view of Lui 210.

The rejection of claim 14 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 14 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “providing a substrate onto the top surface of the table, the substrate being adjacent to the alignment unit and the height of the substrate being same as that of the aligning substrate” and “moving the table the direction which the alignment unit is attached in the table to dispose the syringe over the substrate from the aligning unit attached to one side of the table to dispense the material onto the substrate through the plurality of syringes.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In Response to Argument, the Examiner stated that AAPA explicitly teaches “[t]o align the syringes 402A ~ 402C, the sealant is applied on the dummy substrate 401 through nozzles 403 ~ 403C to form a vertically crossing seal pattern, and then an image of the seal pattern is detected with the image cameras 404A ~ 404C provided at the syringes 402 ~ 402C to check the alignment state and the position of the syringes 402 ~ 402C is compensated” and the dummy substrate of AAPA correlated to the claimed alignment substrate, thus the AAPA clearly teaches that an alignment pattern is formed on the alignment substrate. See page 7, line 25 - page 8, line 2.

Applicants respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s statement. AAPA disclosed “As shown in FIG. 4, the related art seal dispenser includes: a dummy substrate 401 loaded on a table 400; a plurality of syringes 402A~402C filled with a sealant; nozzles 403A~403C provided at one end portion of the syringes 402A~402C and supplying the sealant onto the dummy substrate 401; and image cameras 404A~404C respectively provided at the side of the syringes 403A~403C.” See Specification [0015].

In other words, in AAPA the dummy substrate is disposed on the table and this dummy substrate can be loaded and unloaded from the table. On the contrary, in the claimed invention the alignment unit is disposed at the side of the table, not on the table. In the claimed invention, further, because the alignment unit is attached to ones side of the table, the alignment cannot be loaded or unloaded from the table. Thus, the dummy substrate of AAPA is not correlated to the claimed alignment unit and the AAPA does not teach that an alignment pattern is formed on the alignment unit.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 10-11 and 15-16 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamazaki 395 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Since the rejected claims 10-11 are cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-11.

Claim 15 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "providing a substrate onto the top surface of the table, the substrate being adjacent to the alignment unit and the height of the substrate being same as that of the aligning unit" and "moving the table in the direction which the alignment unit is attached in the table to dispose the syringe over the dispensing position of the substrate from the position of the aligning unit attached to one side of the table to dispense the material onto the substrate through the plurality of syringes." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

As stated to the rejection of claim 14, the dummy substrate of AAPA is not correlated to the claimed alignment unit and the AAPA does not teach that an alignment pattern is formed on the alignment unit. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 and claim 16, which depend from claim 15, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 12 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamazaki 395, and in view of Hashimoto'920 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because the rejected claim 12 is cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12.

The rejection of claim 13 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamazaki 395, and in view of Hashimoto'203 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because the rejected claim 13 is cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13.

The rejection of claim 17 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160 and Yamazaki 395, and in view of Lui 210 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 17 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend respectively from claim 14, which is allowable.

The rejection of claim 18 as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Onuma'160, in view of Lui 210 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 18 is allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend respectively from claim 14, which is allowable.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: November 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By



Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant